

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/644,154	08/20/2003	Akihiro Maezawa	KON-1812	6504	
20311	7590 11/16/2005		EXAMINER		
LUCAS & MERCANTI, LLP			MALEVIC, DJURA		
475 PARK AV 15TH FLOOR	ENUE SOUTH		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
NEW YORK,			2884		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		•		\mathcal{N}'			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	Y \			
		10/644,154	MAEZAWA ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
·		Djura Malevic	2884				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu . Any	CORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION B6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tirgonial apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status		•					
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/24	<u>1/2005</u> .					
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This	action is non-final.					
3)[Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposit	ion of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5,7,8,10-15,17,18 and 20-22</u> is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-5,7,8,10-15,17,18 and 20-22</u> is/are	rejected.					
-	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	relection requirement.					
Applicat	ion Papers						
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on <u>21 August 2003</u> is/are: a) accepted or b) □ objected to by the Examiner.							
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti			(d).			
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119		·				
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of: •							
•	1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.					
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
	application from the International Bureau	, ,,,					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
		•					
Attachmer	nt(s)	•					
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D					
3) Infor	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)		Patent Application (PTO-152)				
	er No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/644,154

Art Unit: 2884

Response to Amendment

The amendment filed 10/24/2005 was entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1 –5, 7, 8, 10 –15, 17, 18, and 20 –22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Isoda (US Pub. 2003/0034458) in further view of Chen et al. (US Patent 6,396,066).

Regarding claims 1 and 11, Isoda discloses a method of and a radiation image-converting panel comprising a substrate (support) [0043], a phosphor layer having thereon a stimulable phosphor [0042], which is formed by electron beam deposition. The said electron beam deposition is used to heat the evaporation source (vapor deposition) [0044], so that the stimulable phosphor layer exhibits a thickness of 100 µm to 1mm, which is within the recited range claimed by the applicant, 50 µm to 20mm. Isoda does not disclose the support exhibiting: a thermal conductivity of 0.1 to Wm⁻¹K⁻¹; a plurality of layers; and having the uppermost layer exhibiting a glass transition temperature of 80 to 350°C.

Chen discloses a support comprised of two or more flexible substrates laminated or adhered to each other, thus disclosing a plurality of layers. Further, Chen teaches that the preferred flexible materials include polymeric films, such as polyethylene

Art Unit: 2884

terephthalate and polyamides (Col. 2, Line 63). Alternatively, one or more substrates are tinted by the incorporation of conventional dyes such as carbon black, since carbon black absorbs stimulating radiation.

Example 1 (Col 8, Line 40) illustrates the preferred support taught by Chen. Two lengths of polyethylene terephthalate film supports (or Polyamides) were mounted onto a roll laminator. The two film supports were set in motion around the rolls and a molten polyethylene was extruded into the nip (between or in the middle), chilled and reformed as a solid, adhering the two polyester supports and forming a laminated structure. The polyethylene used in this instance was tinted black with a concentrated carbon black, thus disclosing a support comprised of a polyimide layer, carbon layer, and a polyimide layer in that order. Note, the thermal conductivity of the polyethylene terephthalate film at 23C is 0.13 – 0.15 Wm⁻¹K⁻¹, which is within the recited range claimed by the applicant, 0.1 – 20.0 Wm⁻¹K⁻¹. Also, polyethylene terephthalate, which is the uppermost layer exhibits a glass transition temperature within the claimed range by the applicant, 80 to 350°C. Isoda and Chen are analogous art because they teach radiation image storage panels.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one skilled in the art to modify Isoda to include the preferred support such as that taught by Chen in order to prevent backscattering by absorbing stimulating radiation therefore, achieving added precision to the radiation image storage phosphor.

Application/Control Number: 10/644,154

Art Unit: 2884

Regarding claims 2 - 4 and 12 - 14, Isoda discloses the stimulable phosphor represented by the following formula, which is the same formula as the applicants by way of variables that convey the same entities (Page 2, Par. 18):

MIX.bMIIX'2.cMIIIX"3: zEu where

M^I being at least one alkali metal element selected from the group consisting of Cs, Li, Na, K and Rb(Page 2, Par. 19).

M^{II} being at least one divalent metal element selected from the group consisting of Be, Mg, Ca, Sr, Ba, Ni, Cu, Sn and Cd (Page 2, Par. 19).

M^{III} being at least one trivalent metal element selected from the group consisting of Sc, Y, La, Ce Pr, Nd, Pm, Sm, Eu, Gd, Tb, Dy, Ho, Er, tm, Yb, Lu, Al, Ga, and In (Page 2, Par. 19).

X, X'₂ and X''₃ are at least One halogen selected from the group consisting of F, Cl, Br and I (Page 2, Par. 19).

Where b, c and z satisfy the following conditions:

 $0 \le b \le 0.5$; $0 \le c \le 0.5$; and $0.0001 \le z \le 0.01$ (Page 2, Par. 19).

Regarding claims 5 and 15, Isoda's disclosure of CsBr:Eu (Page 3, Par. 42) as the stimulable phosphor is inherently represented by the formula: M^IX : eA.

Regarding claims 7, 8, 10, 17, 18, and 20, Chen discloses a support comprised of a polyimide layer (polyethylene terephthalate), carbon layer, and a polyimide layer in that order (example 1), thus comprising one polymeric compound, polyethylene terephthalate, and the specific order claimed.

Application/Control Number: 10/644,154

Art Unit: 2884

Regarding claims 21 and 22, Chen discloses that the uppermost layer is a polyimide layer (example 1).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. (The support taught by Chen comprises layers with the same materials as currently claim and thus inherently exhibits the claimed glass transition temperature).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Djura Malevic whose telephone number is

Art Unit: 2884

571.272.5975. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday between 8:30am and 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Porta can be reached on (571) 272-2444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Djura Malevic Patent Examiner Art Unit 2884 571.272.5975.

DAVID PORTA SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800